

REMARKS

Claims 27-39 and 41-44 are pending in the application. Claims 27, 41-42 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as described in paragraph 2 of the Office Action. Claim 43 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as described in paragraph 3 of the Office Action. Claim 27 is the only independent claim under consideration.

Applicants submit that amended claim 27 and claims 41-44 are patentable over the prior art of record for the following reasons.

As discussed in the specification, for example on page 54, line 24 through page 55, line 4, a re-peel sheet in accordance with the present invention prevents peeling of a member during use after mounting but enables the member to be peeled off for maintenance or other occasions. This feature is recited in amended claim 27 as discussed below.

Amended claim 27 recites, *inter alia*:

a transparent **re-peel sheet** adhesively bonding overall one of a member on which said stationary electrode portion has been directly formed and said liquid crystal display or all of said member, said liquid crystal display and an other member disposed between said member and said liquid crystal display.

Neither Sawai nor Minoru, either singly or in combination, discloses or suggests the above-identified limitation.

Sawai discloses an adhesive layer (PET film 4) disposed on a movable electrode. Minoru discloses an acrylic binder (7) having an adhesive property. Therefore, both Sawai and Minoru disclose an adhesive layer. However, neither one of Sawai or Minoru discloses or suggests a transparent **re-peel sheet**, as recited in amended independent claim 27.

Because neither Sawai nor Minoru discloses or suggests a transparent re-peel sheet, as recited in independent claim 27, a combination of Sawai in view of Minoru additionally fails to disclose or suggest a transparent re-peel sheet, as recited in independent claim 27.

Furthermore, in light of the distinction between claim 27 and that which is disclosed in each of Sawai and Minoru, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would not have been motivated to modify the combination of Sawai and Minoru to arrive at a transparent re-peel sheet as recited in independent claim 27.

As discussed in paragraph 3 of the Office Action, Sugiyama is relied upon for disclosing a fluorine containing polymer composition that "could be used as an antifouling layer for devices such as touch-panels, liquid crystals etc. (col. 15, lines 37-59)." While not addressing whether Sugiyama in fact discloses that which is discussed in paragraph 3 of the Office Action, it is submitted that Sugiyama fails to disclose or suggest a transparent re-peel sheet, as recited in independent claim 27. Therefore, a combination of Sawai, Minoru and Sugiyama additionally fails to disclose or suggest a transparent re-peel sheet, as recited in independent claim 27.

Furthermore, in light of the distinctions between claim 27 and the cited prior art as discussed above, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would not have been motivated to modify a combination of Sawai, Minoru and Sugiyama to arrive at that which is recited in independent claim 27.


Accordingly, claim 27, and dependent claims 41-44, are patentable over the prior art of record within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Having fully and completely responded to the Office Action, Applicants submit that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited.

If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

Respectfully submitted,

Kazuhiko TAKAHATA et al.

By: 
Thomas D. Robbins
Registration No. 43,369
Attorney for Applicants

TDR/abm
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
December 3, 2004